

REMARKS

This current Reply is responsive to a current and final Office Action that is dated 06/14/2005. Of pending claims 1-32, claims 1, 6, and 25 have been amended in this current Reply.

The current Office Action rejected claims 1-32 based on a U.S. Patent. Specifically:

Claims 1-32 were "rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)/103(a) as as being anticipated by/unpatentable over Aharoni et al. (US 6,014,694), hereafter 'Aharoni'."

Of pending claims 1-32, claims 1, 6, 12, 14, 19, and 25 are independent. They are each individually addressed below. Independent claim 12 is addressed below in section I. Independent claims 1, 14, and 25 are addressed below in section II. Independent claims 6 and 19 are addressed below in section III.

1 I. Aharoni et al. neither describes nor renders obvious the discarding of
2 packets at a sending device.

3
4 A. Claim 12 reads:

5 A computer-readable media comprising computer instructions for
6 performing acts comprising:

7 generating prioritization information based at least in part on at least
8 one parameter associated with an application streaming media information;

9 associating packets of the media information with a service class
10 selected from a plurality of different service classes based on the
11 prioritization information;

12 *selectively discarding a portion of the packets of the media*
13 *information in accordance with an adaptive rate control mechanism at a*
14 *sending computing device; and*

15 *selectively outputting some of the packets of media information*
16 *based on their respective service class priority levels.*

17
18 B. The current Office Action reads on page 11 at paragraph #37:

19 As to point (3), Aharoni describes discarding packets at the sender (col.
20 12, lines 42-55).

21
22 C. Aharoni et al. reads at column 12, lines 42-55:

23 The packet generator 102 functions to receive the frames having video
24 data from a particular compression level and encapsulate them into packets for
25 transmission over the network. The assembled packets are output to the packet
transmitter 104 which is responsible for delivery of the packets over the network.
In addition, to preparing packets from the frames received, the packet generator
functions to determine which (if any) frames to skip. Depending on the measured
bandwidth of the channel, the packet generator may skip frames in order to reduce
the transmitted bit rate. This occurs when the bandwidth of the network connection

1 cannot support transmission of every Key, P and B frame. The method of choosing
2 which frames to select is described in more detail hereinbelow.

3 D. It is respectfully submitted that the above-quoted and cited
4 portion of Aharoni et al. fails to describe or render obvious the discarding of
5 packets at a sending computing device.

6 Aharoni et al. does appear to describe the skipping of frames. Skipping
7 frames may ultimately cause fewer packets to be created. However, even assuming,
8 *arguendo*, that skipping frames results in a reduction in the total number of packets
9 created at (and thus a reduction in the total number of packets sent from) a sending
10 device, no packets are actually discarded.

11 Accordingly, no art of record, either alone or in any combination, anticipates
12 or renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
13 elements of claim 12: **selectively discarding a portion of the packets of the media**
14 **information in accordance with an adaptive rate control mechanism at a**
15 **sending computing device.**
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 II. Aharoni et al. neither describes nor renders obvious the inclusion of
2 multiple priorities within a single session.

3
4 A. Claim 1 reads:

5 A method comprising:
6 compressing video objects;
7 generating at least one corresponding elementary stream comprising
8 the compressed video objects;
9 classifying information within each elementary stream based on
10 importance and responsive to the compressed video objects; and
11 *assembling the classified information into packets associated with*
12 *different classes of network packets that belong to a single session.*

13
14 B. Claim 14 reads:

15 An apparatus comprising:
16 logic configured to process content information output by an
17 application layer process and provide resulting processed content
18 information to a network layer process, the logic implementing at least one
19 protocol layer process configured to packetize the content information, a
20 *queuing layer process configured to prioritize the packetized content*
21 *information in accordance with different priorities within a single session,*
22 and a scheduling layer process configured to selectively provide the
23 prioritized packetized content information to the network layer process
24 based on at least one quality of service parameter.

25
26 C. Claim 25 reads:

27 A system comprising:
28 a network environment including a backbone network, and a first
29 access network and a second access network each being operatively coupled
30 to the backbone network;

1 a plurality of host devices including a first host device operatively
2 coupled to the first access network and a second host device operatively
3 coupled to the second access network; and

4 a plurality of application-aware resource controllers including a first
5 application-aware resource controller operatively configured within the first
6 access network and a second application-aware resource controller
7 operatively configured within the second access network, *wherein the first*
8 *application-aware resource controller is configured to selectively aggregate*
9 *content information associated with a single communication session*
10 *established between the first host device and the second host device via the*
11 *network environment, and mapping the aggregated information to at least*
12 *two service classes selected from a group of two or more different service*
13 *classes.*

14 D. The current Office Action reads on page 11 at paragraph #38:

15 As to [point] (4), Aharoni discloses a queuing layer process configured to
16 prioritize the packetized content information in accordance with different priorities
17 within a single session (col. 9, lines 56-61).

18 E. Aharoni et al. reads at column 9, lines 56-61:

19 The raw video source is compressed into multiple types of frames
20 comprised of video data having varying degrees of quality since the network
21 cannot guarantee any particular bandwidth or an error free network connection.
22 Thus, these multiple frame types can be assigned varying degrees of importance or
23 priority. The most important of all the frame types are the Key frames which are
24 assigned the highest priority.
25

1 F. It is respectfully submitted that the above-quoted and cited
2 portion of Aharoni et al. fails to describe or render obvious the inclusion of
3 multiple priorities within a single session.

4 Aharoni et al. does not appear to address in any manner in the referenced
5 portion of Aharoni et al. the concept of a "session." Session is not described either
6 in the context of a communication layer or a communication state. Hence, Aharoni
7 et al. cannot describe multiple priorities within a single session.

8 Accordingly, no art of record, either alone or in any combination, anticipates
9 or renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
10 elements of their respective claims:

11 **Claim 1: assembling the classified information into packets associated**
12 **with different classes of network packets that belong to a single**
13 **session.**

14 **Claim 14: a queuing layer process configured to prioritize the packetized**
15 **content information in accordance with different priorities within**
16 **a single session.**

17 **Claim 25: wherein the first application-aware resource controller is**
18 **configured to selectively aggregate content information associated**
19 **with a single communication session established between the first**
20 **host device and the second host device via the network**
21 **environment, and mapping the aggregated information to at least**
22 **two service classes selected from a group of two or more different**
23 **service classes.**

1 III. Aharoni et al. neither describes nor renders obvious the prioritization
2 of packets based on user interaction.

3
4 A. Claim 6 reads:

5 A method comprising:

6 packetizing content information;

7 *generating resource coordination information based at least in part*
8 *on at least one prioritizing parameter associated with an application*
9 *communicating the content information and on one or more prioritizing*
10 *parameters associated with a user interaction;*

11 *selectively associating each packet of content information with a*
12 *service class selected from among at least two different service classes*
13 *based on the resource coordination information;*

14 *selectively outputting at least one packet of content information*
15 *based on a priority associated with the service class associated with the*
16 *packet of content information; and*

17 *providing the at least one packet of content information to a network.*

18
19 B. Claim 19 reads:

20 An apparatus comprising:

21 packetizer logic configured to receive encoded content information
22 and output corresponding packets of content information;

23 collaborator logic operatively coupled to the packetizer logic and
24 configured to receive at least one prioritizing parameter associated with at
25 least one application, including an application communicating the content
information, and *one or more prioritizing parameters associated with a user
interaction; the collaborator logic further configured to output resource
coordination information based at least in part on the at least one
prioritizing parameter associated with the application and the one or more
prioritizing parameters associated with the user interaction;*

1 *priority mapping logic operatively coupled to the collaborator logic*
2 *and configured to receive the packetized content information and the*
3 *resource coordination information, and selectively associate each received*
4 *packet of content information with a service class selected from among at*
5 *least two different service classes based on the resource coordination*
6 *information, and selectively output at least one packet of content*
7 *information based on a priority associated with each service class; and*

8 forwarder logic operatively coupled to the priority mapping logic and
9 configurable to provide the at least one packet of content information to a
10 network.

11 C. The current Office Action reads on page 11 at paragraph #39:

12 As to point (5), Aharoni discloses prioritization resulting from user
13 interaction feedback (col. 7, line 60 to col. 8, line 17; and col. 19, lines 15-21).

14 D. Aharoni et al. reads at column 7, line 60 to column 8, line 17
15 and at column 19, lines 15-21:

16 The sender functions to accept video frame data from the receiver and
17 encapsulate the video data into packets for transmission of the network to the
18 client. Each client that requests a connection to be established causes an instance of
19 the sender to be created. Requests for multiple video sources from the same client
20 cause additional instances of the sender to be created. The sender functions to
21 assemble packets for transmission from the video source data input to the receiver.
22 The packets are formed on the basis of the current choice for the level of video
23 transmission quality. Based on bandwidth measurements, the sender determines the
24 appropriate level of quality to transmit to the client to best match the available
25 bandwidth. Assembled packets are sent to the network for delivery over the
network connection to the video client(s).

The sender also measures the available bandwidth of the network
connection between the video server and the video client. As described in more
detail, the sender utilizes the bandwidth measurements to determine the appropriate

1 video quality level to send over the connection. If too low a video quality is chosen
2 then network bandwidth is wasted and a better picture could be hand the client
3 display. On the other hand, if too high a video level is chosen then too much data
4 may become lost or computed which also causes the quality of the picture on the
5 client display to suffer.

6 [...]

7 In addition, the video client 220 is adapted to issue the video file requests
8 to the rate controller 222 rather than to any of the video servers 1 through N.
9 Throughout the video transmission session, the video client 220 functions to return
10 acknowledgments and statistics to the rate controller 222. The rate controller uses
11 the acknowledgments and statistics returned by the video client 220 in order to
12 calculate the optimum compression (resolution) level to use.

13 E. It is respectfully submitted that the above-quoted and cited
14 portion of Aharoni et al. fails to describe or render obvious the prioritization
15 of packets based on user interaction.

16 Aharoni et al. does appear to address compression determination using
17 statistics received from a video client. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that there is some
18 relevant relationship between a compression determination and prioritization or
19 service class, there is no user interaction described or suggested in Aharoni et al.,
20 including in the referenced portion as reproduced above.

21 Accordingly, no art of record, either alone or in any combination, anticipates
22 or renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other
23 elements of their respective claims:

24 **Claim 6: generating resource coordination information based at least in**
25 **part on at least one prioritizing parameter associated with an**
application communicating the content information and on one or
more prioritizing parameters associated with a user interaction . .

1 . selectively associating each packet of content information with a
2 service class selected from among at least two different service
3 classes based on the resource coordination information.

4 Claim 19: one or more prioritizing parameters associated with a user
5 interaction; the collaborator logic further configured to output
6 resource coordination information based at least in part on the at
7 least one prioritizing parameter associated with the application
8 and the one or more prioritizing parameters associated with the
9 user interaction . . . priority mapping logic operatively coupled to
10 the collaborator logic and configured to receive the packetized
11 content information and the resource coordination information,
12 and selectively associate each received packet of content
13 information with a service class selected from among at least two
14 different service classes based on the resource coordination
15 information.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 6, 12, 14, 19, and 25
3 have been provided above. Claims 2-5, 7-11, 13, 15-18, 20-24, and 26-32 depend
4 from the independent claims 1, 6, 12, 14, 19, and 25, respectively. Although each
5 also includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability, it is respectfully
6 submitted that these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given
7 above in connection with their respective independent claims.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims 1-32 are allowable,
and prompt action to that end is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8/6/2005

By: Keith W. Saunders
Keith W. Saunders
Reg. No. 41,462
(509) 324-9256 x238